

Your last chance...

No. 99 NOVEMBER 1976

Spearhead

15p



Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

The need is strong government

The call by Harold Macmillan, a past failure, for all the current party failures to join together in a Government of National Failure (or 'Unity' as he called it) in order to solve the economic crisis is something we hear on every occasion when Britain teeters on the brink.

The absurd idea seems to be that if all the failed men of the individual Establishment parties, whose policies have brought us to national ruin and humiliation in three decades, are all lumped together in a "national government", then miraculously their weakness and political incompetence will undergo some transformation; and out of this poisonous brew will emerge a new recipe for national salvation. Was there ever a suggestion more daft?

The fact that it was roundly rejected by everyone (with the exception of some approving noises from the Liberals) signifies only that the main parties both feel they can

just about ride the crisis until an election. If they thought for one moment that the public was looking right now towards a new political force such as the National Front for the salvation of Britain, they would not hesitate to save their joint skins by forming a "government of national unity".

The British people may not be looking to the National Front right now, but they soon will be. It will soon become apparent that only new men can finally put an end to Britain's **thirty year crisis**. The reason is simply this. It is not national government that is now needed. It is not even the right policies alone that are needed. What is needed is **strong government**. It is leadership with the firm will to take corrective action, inspiring confidence at home and abroad. Newspaper articles do not topple the currencies of mighty states.

The policies needed are equally clear. The cries to cut public expenditure (for example, by halting local authority house-building) in order to reduce Government borrowing fails to get at the root cause of the trouble — the financial system under which the Government (and local authorities) borrow money into circulation at interest from private bankers who are permitted to create new money at the fantastic rate of 27 per cent a year. But above all, new policies need new leaders — leaders of strong will and ruthless resolution.

Race and mugging

The suggestion from Judge Gwyn Morris that vigilante patrols may be required in order to protect elderly white women from assaults by black muggers brought predictable condemnation from Race Relations Industry spokesmen, whose opinion should not be listened to on anything, least of all



JUDGE GWYN MORRIS

black muggers. This journal is the strongest supporter of law and order, and therefore of the police force, yet we lend our whole-hearted support to Judge Morris. The police force alone must be responsible for the containment of crime — that is admitted. But what happens if the stage is reached when the police force is no longer able to contain crime at this level on its own? Perhaps that stage has already been reached. In any event, a total collapse of law and order will in the end mean that British citizens, whether they like it or not, will be called upon to defend themselves and their womenfolk.

There is no doubt either that they will be defending themselves from black criminals. It was gratifying to see that Judge Morris drew attention to the racial origins of those who commit these fiendish crimes against elderly women — white women, as he further pointed out.

It seems that, at last, the National Front is being joined by one or two other sane people who are prepared to sweep aside the liberal hogwash of the race industry and nail mugging for the racial crime it is. 92 per cent of the muggers in Peckham, according to recent police figures, are black — and, say the police, they will soon kill. Who will be opposing vigilantes when the killing starts?

Hijacking the right

The elections in West Germany last month were an object lesson in the danger to genuine nationalism from the opportunist antics of the Conservative "right wing". They showed how, if necessary, the exponents of liberal conservatism will hijack the entire policies of genuine nationalists simply to win an election on the strength of their obvious popularity.

The German equivalent of the Conservative party, the Christian Democrats, have gradually adopted, or rather appeared to adopt, nearly all the policies of the nationalist NPD — which, as a result, has shrunk to virtually nothing. Fierce anti-Communism, opposition to foreign aid, a clamp-down on subversives and leftist extremists, and the

S P E A R H E A D

No. 99 NOVEMBER 1976

Office: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middlesex (Tel: 01-977 2452)

Publisher: John Tyndall

Editor: Richard Verrall B.A. Contributing Editor: Martin Webster

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

denunciation of the opposing party policies as near Communist, particularly on *detente* with eastern Europe — all were proclaimed in the most “right wing” CDU platform for thirty years. They even became opposed to coloured immigration — “though we do not go as far as the NPD, which advocates ‘German jobs for German workers’”, said a CDU official.

The play was a clever one and nearly worked, but not quite. The Liberal-Socialist coalition won a majority, but it was a close thing. Needless to say, had the CDU won the election, those popular “right wing” policies would never have been heard of again.

The lesson for Britain is obvious, for half-hearted attempts have already been made by the Tory party, in the shape of the Tory candidate for Stechford among others, to hijack — or appear to hijack — National Front anti-immigration policies. Those attempts must be exposed as the frauds they are.

Tory flim-flam on race

The Tory conference last month showed itself adept, not so much at out-right hijacking as in the more subtle art of flim-flam. The greatest exponent of this “Now you see it — now you don’t” policy on immigration was lovable *creme pouffe* William Whitelaw, who managed to be both for and against immigration.

His speech in Leicester, in which he suggested that a Conservative Government would give thought to setting a date, some time in the future, when a decision *might* be taken to stop immigration, was followed at the Tory conference by a statement to the effect that the Tory party was in favour **in principle** of establishing a register of dependants (bold move!), which in turn “might have to mean” a quota system “to regulate entry in an orderly way”.

This pathetic nonsense was described as a ‘tough’ policy in all newspapers, and as “statesmanship on an unprecedented level” by the editorial of the *Daily Telegraph*. (Statesmanship meaning an ability to slide, slither and manoeuvre in an effort to project phoney policies pleasing all sides while doing nothing).

The fact that this ‘tough’ policy was in complete contradiction to the statement of the Shadow Cabinet on Britain’s ‘obligation’ to the 40,000 East African Asians did not seem to matter to those anti-immigration elements who are still wasting their time in the Conservative party. They seemed quite happy.

Equally happy with this policy were Conservative candidate Narinder Saroop and West Indian Conservative councillor Basil Lewis, who provided the “two splendidly Tory speeches from coloured immigrant delegates” praised by the *Telegraph*. “Blacks”, you see, (according to Edward Heath), “are basically Conservative”, and with ‘tough’

policies like those of Willie Whitelaw, can you blame them?

Although grass-roots Tories seem to have fallen for this utterly fraudulent “anti-immigration” nonsense spouted at their conference, we feel certain the British people did not.

‘Moderation’ doomed to fail

Another object lesson from abroad, this time from Spain. It is reported that, as Spain in the post-Franco period slides progressively towards communism and anarchy, a new political party of the right has been formed to fight the elections next year and combat the dangerous trends.

So far so good. But alas, it was announced that the new party, called the Popular Alliance, was projecting itself as “a conservative and moderate party”, which accepted reforms so long as they were ‘gradual’ and ‘responsible’.

One would have hoped that the past history of the Spanish people would have educated them long ago to the folly of fighting communism with ‘moderation’, and of accepting reforms (i.e. accepting communism) gradually — as if it makes any difference whether Communism comes later rather than sooner.

Smug Spanish ‘democrats’ are now enjoying themselves reading the latest smug biography of General Franco written by his cousin — which portrays the great man muttering imprecations against Communists and Freemasons during dull dinners at *El Pardo* Palace. But if Communism is ever allowed to get its hands on Spain now Franco has gone, those democrats will not be quite so smug — and the ‘moderate’ anti-communists will be fervently wishing that they had been nasty, ruthless and thoroughly extreme.

Works of art

The exhibition of soiled nappies, sadism and pornography at the Institute of Contemporary Arts was paid for by the taxpayer, of course, whose money is filched for the loathsome Arts Council which then squanders £90,000 of it on organising these exhibitions of decadent and revolting garbage.

It is ironic that while there has been no effort to forbid the Arts Council’s homage to filth, there have been cries from all quarters to prosecute the National Front merely for the production of a propaganda poster (see front cover). It seems to us that the poster certainly is a work of art, commenting brilliantly on the state of British society. Besides, since we are told that pornography is good for us, and that the poster is “obscene”, perhaps the poster is good for us.

General Brown’s indiscretion

The denunciation of Gen. George Brown, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, seemed out of all proportion to his supposedly offensive remarks. He stated that America “has no stomach” for defending the West, which is perfectly true, and that the state of Britain’s defence forces is “pathetic”, which is also perfectly true. His statement that all we have now is “generals, admirals and bands”, coming as it did from an obvious admirer of Britain and her military capabilities, should have been taken as the bluntly expressed but genuine concern which it clearly was.

Why the denunciation of Gen. Brown from all sides? Could it have something to do with the fact that he also said Israel was a “burden” to America, which is perfectly true? Gen. Brown, it will be remembered, declared not long ago that Israel virtually



GENERAL GEORGE BROWN

controlled the American Congress, and that a powerful Zionist lobby was in control of the banks and the media. That is also perfectly true. Quite evidently, Gen. Brown is not being criticised and reprimanded at the highest level for being indiscreet, but only for being indiscreet about certain things.

NATIONAL FRONT SOUTH EAST REGION CHRISTMAS DANCE

River Boat Disco Dance

Friday, December 3rd at 8 p.m.

Dance to a top disco as the boat cruises the river. All decks are covered in. Excellent buffet arranged by Hackney Branch. Licensed bar. Pick-up points are Lambeth & Greenwich Piers. For tickets, price £3.00, contact Alan Wilkins 854-9423 or Don Turner, 252-9680.

AFRICAN "MODERATION" ...

"I will not rest until the rivers of Zimbabwe run red with the blood of every white man, woman and child, and every African who supports them."

Who said that? Joshua Nkomo said it in 1961. Nkomo is the man described as a "moderate" by the British Government. He is the person invited by Britain to head the African delegation to the Geneva Conference on the future of Rhodesia.

This so-called "moderate" is, in fact, nothing more than a bloodthirsty savage who, as leader of ZAPU, has a twenty year history of terrorism and murder. In March 1976 he told a meeting of the African National Council: **"We want immediate black majority rule, and if Smith will not agree he must be destroyed. Whites cannot expect any guarantee of property or person when we have black majority rule."**

ZAPU, at the time when it was called the National Democratic Party and still led by Nkomo, once stated: **"We are prepared to leave our country to the sweet winds that come in the wake of devastation."** This is the advanced state of political philosophy reached by African terrorists like Joshua Nkomo.

Another person described as a "moderate" by Henry Kissinger and the British Government, and whose co-operation was sought in the determining of Rhodesia's future, is Kenneth Kaunda, now President of Zambia. Before he reached that exalted position, he was head of the terrorist "Zambia African National Congress" in the days when the country was called Northern Rhodesia. Sir Arthur Benson, the British Governor, described this organisation as "Murder Incorporated".

In the rural areas of Northern Rhodesia the Z.A.N.C. instituted a horrific reign of terror. Cannibalism and witchcraft were invoked by Z.A.N.C. agents; the wives and children of natives who voted the wrong way in territorial elections were horribly



KAUNDA
"Murder Incorporated"



NKOMO
"Rivers of Blood"

mutilated. **"For any informer at all you should see to it that you get out his eyes,"** Z.A.N.C. members were instructed. Meanwhile, the *Daily Mirror* was telling the British people at home that Kaunda was "one of the most moderate and intelligent of African politicians . . . Mr. Kaunda is known to be utterly opposed to violence."

After Kaunda had come to power in Zambia he ordered the notorious massacre of the Alice Lenshina religious community. Many of the villagers were burned alive. Men had been trussed up, castrated and their members thrust into their mouths. Women had their breasts and private parts treated with burning faggots.

... AND THE MEANING OF WHITE SUPREMACY

What should be understood by white racialists is that these are not isolated excesses by people who are separate from some mythical majority of decent, law-abiding and "moderate" Africans whose existence is fervently believed in by liberals. Aside from the fact that these people are themselves portrayed as leading "moderates", Nkomo and Kaunda are typical of the African race and the African mind. It is only because, for decades, these savage child-people have been portrayed as something quite different by the liberal media that even sincere pro-Rhodesians have come to believe in the inevitability of "majority rule".

We have heard of these sincere but misguided people saying that the white man could not rightfully maintain his rule in a black majority country, and that Ian Smith's capitulation was therefore "realistic". Nothing could be further from the truth. It is no use being dishonest about the character of the Negro out of a liberal desire to be polite. Everything we know about these simple, savage and cultureless people shows that they and White Civilisation are incompatible. Cruelty is a way of life to the

African (and unlike the European he is not even conscious of it); for millenia he has proved himself incapable of founding or sustaining civilisation; his personality, as the Central African Journal of Medicine described it, is hysterical and psychopathic.

If the Negro and White Civilisation are incompatible, then one must give way to the other. White supremacy built Africa from a savage wilderness into a continent of civilised law and order. By what possible right, therefore, is the African to have any say whatever in the destiny of the White Race? Either the White Race maintains its supremacy, for the sake of a superior moral order, or it hands over to savagery and waves goodbye to its own existence. The alternative to supremacy is subservience, for White supremacy is synonymous with White survival.

The African is no liberal. He understands only that the strong survive and the weak perish. If we continue to propound the Communist doctrine that we are no better than they are, and simperingly reject the necessity of being the masters, then our civilisation is doomed.

PARLIAMENT FRONT

THE MENACE OF THE NEW RACE BILL

IT IS perhaps no coincidence that the new Race Relations Bill will be coming into effect at the same time that the Labour and Conservative Parties are waging their campaigns against the National Front.

Outside Parliament the Labour Party will be carrying out its smear campaign and the Tory Party will be attempting to ridicule the National Front. Inside Parliament all three parties will be savagely reducing our freedom of speech, our freedom of choice and our opportunities for employment, while elevating immigrants to the status of a specially favoured group.

The aim of this new Race Relations Bill is, as the introduction to the White Paper stated, to correct the inadequacies of the present Act. Apparently the government believes that the present Race Relations Act is not powerful enough (Robert Relf might not agree), that it does not eliminate covert discrimination and that the Race Relations Board and the Community Relations Commission do not have enough money to fight racials and racial discrimination. The new Race Relations Act is designed to correct all this.

Under the present Race Act it is necessary to prove actual discrimination on the grounds of colour before a prosecution can be successful. The government intend to change this, and so section 35 of the White Paper stated:

"It should also prohibit practices which are fair in a formal sense, but discriminatory in their operation and effect. For example, employers and trade unions should be required to dismantle unjustifiable barriers to employment opportunities when the barriers operate to discriminate against racial minorities."

Thus if you go for a job and have the same qualifications but greater experience than a rival "minority group" candidate, the employer may have to take on the rival, because to take into account your experience of a particular technique or system which is not found in West Pakistan would be an "unjustifiable barrier to employment opportunities".

Ken to show that its own house is in order, the government also gives us an insight into Civil Service policy towards the employment of immigrants. Thus Section 17 stated:

"Departments (of the Civil Service) have been warned to be on their guard against any unconscious discrimination, including preconceptions and prejudices in such areas as the allocation of work and the assessment

of managerial potential. They have also been advised that special training (for instance in communication and understanding the Civil Service System) may be desirable to enable staff to realise their full potential in the Civil Service."

The government seems to be quite blind to the plight of unemployed whites who are able to "communicate and understand", but seems hell-bent on ensuring that, in future, as many jobs as possible are given to blacks.

In the field of education we have the same double standards. Education authorities are required to administer without discrimination (against blacks), but on the other hand, they will have a general duty to meet the "special needs of the individual", i.e. when they are black.

In a desperate attempt to promote the social standing of our immigrant communities, the issue of discrimination in Private Clubs is again raised. Under the 1968 Act, some categories of clubs and societies were allowed to choose who joined them. The new Bill makes it illegal for a club or any other voluntary body to discriminate as regards to admission or treatment of members on racial grounds. Whilst I cannot see Tariq Ali wanting to join the National Front, such an application could prove interesting. Of course the Bill is not wholly one-sided. In future National Front members will be allowed to join "Asian Workers Clubs" and the like — a dubious privilege.

ONE HORRENDOUS MONSTER

To help enforce all this legislation the present Race Relations Board and the Community Relations Commission are to be merged into one horrendous monster, the name of which is still the subject of some debate. This beast is to be given a new set of dentures, the emphasis being now on punishment as opposed to reconciliation. It seems that although the first Race Relations Act was enough to deter such spineless characters as Kingsley-Read, the Home Office fears that the more typical British character has the tenacity of Robert Relf.

The government is also attempting to change the normal procedure of "innocent until proved guilty" to the alien concept of "guilty until proved innocent". In the committee stage in the House of Lords, Lord Hailsham has summed this up:

"The purpose of Clause 2 is to say, notwithstanding the fact that you have not

discriminated at all under the main provisions of this Bill, that if someone brings proceedings against you . . . or gives evidence or even information against you . . . then you are to be treated as having discriminated against him. In my opinion that is pretty rough stuff. A man who is innocent of anything is to be treated as guilty of something though he has not admittedly done it, if somebody else says something untruthful against him."

So if someone accuses you of racial discrimination then, again to quote Lord Hailsham: "I have to prove both that the information was false and that it was not made in good faith before I can get out of all these adverse consequences."

During the House of Lords committee stage, Lord Hailsham managed to get through a number of amendments. These have, in the most part, been technicalities, but some of the more oppressive clauses have been modified or completely dropped. Thus he has managed to reverse the "guilty before proved innocent" clause; but from our point of view the most important change has been in the notorious "Incitement to Racial Hatred" section.

The House of Lords has quashed the clause whereby the government would have made it illegal to say or publish anything which might be likely to increase racial hatred, whether or not it is a true statement and whether or not such was the intention. If this became law, there is no doubt that many of Enoch Powell's speeches would be illegal as well as much other nationalist literature.

At the time of writing the House of Lords decision stands, but already M.P.s have been asked to return the Bill to its original state when the Bill goes back to the House of Commons. If this happens we can expect to see both immigrant groups and left wingers pressing for prosecution of anyone who expresses ideas or opinions which are of a racist character, and this would even include jokes about racial minorities such as the Scots and the Welsh.

In short this new Race Relations Bill is designed, not to promote "equality" but to suppress your rights and freedoms, and to ensure that immigrant groups are elevated to the status of legal superiority over the indigenous white population. If you oppose this suppression then write to your M.P. and support the National Front in its fight.

This Bill must be destroyed.

Show the Flag

FLAGS, ROSETTES,
POLES ETC.

SEND STAMP FOR LIST

W. BROWN, 20 SUTTON WAY,
HESTON, MIDDX, TW5 0JA

Rhodesia:**THE ANATOMY OF
WHITE SURRENDER**

IN THE WAKE of final capitulation by the Government of Rhodesia to 'majority rule' there is the temptation to take the harshest view of Ian Smith — that he has been all along a conscious and willing agent of the internationalist power clique that has contrived the downfall of Rhodesia's Whites and that he has maintained the posture of a strong-line White patriot only to deceive. I know some who believe this to be the correct interpretation of Smith's behaviour from 1965 to the present, and there is much in the Smith record that could give rise to such a theory.

Smith after all has stated more than once over the past decade that he did not envisage majority rule in Rhodesia "in his lifetime", and this assurance has been the basis of his support in the country. That he has now endorsed an agreement for the transfer of power to the Blacks within two years certainly does suggest that on this question those who have supported him have been tragically misled — in no different way from that in which our own rulers in Britain misled the electorate as an occupational habit.

I have often pondered myself over the possibility that Smith has been intending to sell out all the time and has just been playing along with the White electorate with a view to betraying them at the opportune moment. The factors that have caused this are twofold. My late friend and colleague, A. K. Chesterton, met Smith in the 1960s and formed the opinion that he was not to be relied upon. I never knew A.K. to be wrong in his appraisal of any political leader. Two other friends and political allies, Ivor Benson and Alan Rudd, both of whom are extremely well informed on Rhodesian politics, have come to the same conclusion. When three men whose judgement I respect so much take such a common view, I am very loath to ignore it.

The second factor is Smith's behaviour itself, which has seemed to confirm what my three friends have said. Why, I have asked myself, would a man who is totally committed to the maintenance of White leadership in Rhodesia, be wasting his time regularly throughout all these years conferring with one after another politician known to be totally committed to the opposite aim? With no conceivable common ground on which to negotiate, the time and expense of these meetings might be saved.

And why — as reports coming to me regularly from Rhodesia make clear — has Smith been systematically purging from his

party hierarchy one after another known White 'hard-liner' and been installing in their place liberals only very little less wet than the brand we have here in Britain?

All these considerations give strong weight to the idea that the real intentions of Mr. Ian Smith have run directly opposite to the image of him portrayed by the mass media in this country and to the speeches by which he has regularly rallied the Rhodesian White voters to his side.

On the other hand, there is the view, put cogently by the supporters of Mr. Smith, that the surrender to which he has now pledged himself was not wished by him but was forced upon him by the enormous pressures brought to bear against Rhodesia in the realm of economics, guerilla warfare and international power-diplomacy, in which latter field Dr. Henry Kissinger has been the most conspicuous operator. That such pressures have existed is something not in doubt, and in his article in last month's issue Martin Webster analysed the nature of those pressures and how they have increased intensively over the last year. The story of these pressures at work is the story of the International Global Conspiracy operating in its most naked and ruthless form. Part of that story consists of the pressures applied against South Africa itself, which in turn brought her to change her former policy of co-operation with Mr. Smith.

GREATER CREDIT

It may well be that this rather more charitable explanation of the Rhodesian leader's actions is the correct one. If it is, however, I would only say this: that if Mr. Smith did in fact have no alternative but to surrender he would have brought much greater credit upon himself had he stood up before the world and said just that in unmistakable terms, spelling out the whole gruesome story of intimidation and blackmail that had brought his country to the point of defeat, and roundly condemning and exposing the miserable role of the major Western powers, including Britain, in this series of developments.

As it was, Mr. Smith did no such thing. On the contrary, he spoke and acted as if the settlement he had reached with Kissinger was a settlement acceptable to the White Rhodesian people from the stand point both of security and honour — whereas in fact it is nothing of the kind.

Whatever the true motives of Mr. Smith have been, we might have hoped for

time after the first announcement of his deal with Kissinger that he would be quickly overthrown by a massive revolt within his party and country as a result of which a new leader would be installed who would repudiate the agreement root and branch. No such revolt came, however. As the *Sunday Express* (26th September) reported, "One after another of the ordinary Rhodesians on the streets questioned about the settlement responded: 'If it's good enough for Ian Smith, it's good enough for me.'"

To those in this country who had placed such great faith in the sturdiness and political good sense of the White Rhodesian people, this reaction must have come as a shock. Such slave-like willingness to unthinkingly follow a leader even unto defeat and catastrophe was something with which we associated the dumb faithful of the British Tory and Labour parties, not the seemingly more robust minded members of the Rhodesian Front and its supporters.

And what of the Nationalists of South Africa? Was it unreasonable to hope that they, recognising the strategic implications of Mr. Vorster's policy of abandoning Rhodesia to the wolves, would topple him and immediately put his policy into reverse? While there have been protests in South Africa, notably the demonstration outside Vorster's home by a delegation from the Reformed Nationalist Party, there has not to date been any opposition on a scale likely to endanger Vorster's position as Premier or to reverse his line on Rhodesia.

ONLY THE POSTURE REMAINS

This will not come as any surprise to those who have regularly followed the commentaries of S. E. D. Brown in his *South African Observer* over the past few years. These commentaries show how, under pressure from the vast cosmopolitan mining and financial interests in South Africa and their international affiliates, the Nationalist Party has undergone a gradual 'liberalising' process whereby, one-by-one, the traditional principles of White leadership and Separate Development have been eroded so that now only the posture of a right-wing, nationalist party remains.

The procedure followed to 'soften up' South African opinion and atrophy the will of the White South Africans to survive as a dominant racial group has been more or less the same as that followed in Rhodesia. The press, always a servant of cosmopolitan business rather than national interests, has studiously avoided such obvious heresies as "we must surrender to the Blacks" but instead has sought to prepare the people for just that event by the tactics of confusion and sheer verbiage, chipping away at the edifice of White leadership by the use of semantic claptrap such as "forward-looking policies", "adapting to a changing world", "inter-racial dialogue", etc.

The technique has followed that

employed to bamboozle and neutralise British Conservatives while the Empire was being surrendered. Never was there a straight and honest affirmation that we had the choice of holding onto the Empire or losing it; instead there was the presentation of an illusory 'half-way house', the 'Commonwealth', under which we could be led to think that we had preserved all that was worth keeping in the Empire but at the same time struck a peaceful bargain with its enemies whereby we would be spared all the irksome effort of standing up to them — a perfect formula for the morally senile and the intellectually paralytic!

Likewise in Northern Ireland, the stark alternatives of victory for British rule or capitulation to the IRA have been obliterated by jargon about 'power-sharing' in which semantics again succeed in reconciling the irreconcilable, lulling patriots to sleep and giving traitors and subversives justified hope.

Southern Africa's experience has been no different. Faced with the reality that there was no middle way, no compromise, between victory and surrender, the Whites almost certainly would have opted for victory and immediately got down to organising their affairs so as to ensure that result. By being persuaded that intermediate options exist, they have allowed their will to be blunted and their sense of direction lost. In Rhodesia they have woken up one morning to find that the very thing that they in the majority opposed has come about. In South Africa they are going to wake up not so many mornings later and find the same thing facing them.

All this is tragic, really and truly tragic. Rhodesia and South Africa have been the hope of regenerate White people all over the world. To them we looked for example and inspiration as well as practical help. Now Rhodesia has crumbled and South Africa, on evidence, is well on the way to the same destination.


What lessons can we learn from this catastrophe? I suggest that there are a few which should be very clear to us.

NOT STRONG ENOUGH

The pressures applied against Rhodesian and South African rulers have been very great and have required a very strong will to resist. In the face of these pressures, the will shown has indeed been strong but, as it turns out, not strong enough. Once again a White community has surrendered to the familiar alliance of Colour, Communism and Cash — surrendered after a better fight than most of us have put up but surrendered nevertheless. Obviously, a mightier will than even Rhodesia has shown and South Africa looks like showing is going to be needed if the White Man is to avoid collapse and re-assert his rightful place in the world. How is this will going to be acquired?

I submit that it will only be acquired

RHODESIAN WHITES BEFORE SURRENDER
Old World values,
not modern racial nationalism



through a total rejection of the old-style politics of the Western World, with their inevitable weaknesses, compromises and liberal ethics.

It is easy to lose sight of the fact that Rhodesia and South Africa have in the composition of their White societies been not basically different from ourselves. Despite the familiar labels of 'Nazi', 'Fascist' and 'Racist' slapped upon them by their extreme left-wing enemies, both these countries have remained liberal democracies, with party systems and political balances of power similar to Britain in substance if not in degree.

Both have tolerated within their midst that immensely potent 'State within the State', the international Money Power, without ever really seriously setting about subordinating that institution to the political will of government. The Money Power has in its turn come to own and dominate most of the opinion media in both countries, with the result that what passes for 'public opinion' has only been very little less disorientated and confused than in Britain. There has scarcely been a major newspaper in either Rhodesia or South Africa that could be truly called 'national'. The press has placed itself in the forefront of every movement away from traditional principles of White leadership and into the murky grey fog of half-way politics, with their 'dialogue' with national enemies and their fantasies about 'power-sharing' and other such idiotic concepts.

SAME FOUNDATIONS

In many ways Rhodesian and South African societies have differed from that of the United Kingdom only in so far as they have stood in recent times at a stage fairly similar to that at which our own stood in the 1930s. They have shared the same founda-

tions common to nearly all 20th century Western societies by which the nation is seen, not as a corporate body, with a destiny that transcended every selfish private interest, but as an atomistic concept in which nationhood is only the sum total of so many individuals, pursuing first and foremost their individual destinies, ambitions and wants, while the State merely acts as a referee holding the ring to ensure that some observance of the rules is maintained.

The difference between these two concepts is more important than might first meet the eye. In an atomistic society, i.e. one in which the individual good comes uppermost, patriotism can be maintained just so long as it does not inconvenience that prior motive for living. Once it does threaten to do so, patriotism is liable to become expendable.

As the heat began to be turned increasingly on Rhodesia, many families with a far-sighted sense of their own welfare, prosperity and security began to leave or to prepare to leave. As individuals they are not to be condemned for this because, brought up under an ethos in which the individual is paramount and in which no special racial tie exists, they were only doing the right thing by their own lights. Race to them was only a means of telling one individual from another, nationhood only a marriage of convenience between persons happening to live in the same area.

Contrary to what its enemies assert. Rhodesia never was a racist society or a racist state, and that was precisely one of the things that contributed to its weakness. Asked to defend their Constitution, Rhodesian leaders would habitually dodge making the assertion that it was based on a recognition of racial differences. Asked about the guerilla war on and within Rhodesia's frontiers, they would habitually protest that

Contd. on page 15

THE FOLLOWING is the text of the closing speech made by the National Front Chairman, John Tyndall, to the NF Annual Conference in London on October 16th, 1976.

Mr. Chairman, fellow members,

This is the third time that I've had the honour to address this, our annual meeting, as Leader of our party. This is always a moment of great satisfaction and pride, but never so much as it is today.

We meet today at the end of a year of trial and struggle for our movement in which, at one time, we were threatened with disintegration contrived by enemies within. As I left our annual meeting a year ago, I remember many people asking: will there still be a National Front a year hence? Or, if there is, will it be a National Front unrecognisable as the one that we know, and following a path totally different from the path intended by its founders?

As I left that meeting last year I resolved, not only that our party would not disintegrate, but that it would come to this meeting this year a stronger and more united party than ever before, that it would be re-dedicated to the original ideals of its founders, and that all the people who had sought to disrupt, subvert and hi-jack the party would be thrown out, never to return.

Fellow members, we have succeeded in all those objectives. Today the National Front stands once again as the movement which strikes fear into the Establishment of this country – and even more than ever before. In 1973 and '74 we were much talked about, much publicised. But our publicity came mainly from the noise we made in the streets; we were not yet considered as a serious factor in the balance of political power in this country. Now, from all sides of the spectrum, from the Labour and Liberal conferences, from the T.U.C. and from the Tories as well, the words ring out: 'The National Front is a danger; it could take many votes in the next election; it could, in a worsening situation in this country, and with a collapse of confidence in the old parties, one day actually win power!'

We've advanced to this position in just a few months. At the beginning of this year we inherited a state of administrative chaos, near financial bankruptcy and widespread demoralisation in the ranks. The newspapers were gloating that the National Front was finished, washed up, *kaput*. I cannot begin to tell you what a shambles was left behind by those who had control of the party at the end of last year. All this had to be cleared up and the party rebuilt. That this has been achieved in the way that it has is little short of a miracle.

FINEST SET OF COLLEAGUES

For all this, I have reason to be grateful to the finest set of colleagues I've ever had the honour to work with. If I ever needed to be assured about the future of our party, I've found that assurance in the extraordinary dedication and great ability of that group of people who have now risen to lead and run the National Front. In our Directorate today there is not only the greatest pool of brains and talent that we've ever had; there's also the greatest ever unity of faith and unity of purpose. One newspaper said that the NF has been completely taken over by hard-liners and all liberal and populist elements have been pushed out. That paper was absolutely right – this is exactly what has happened and this is the way it's going to be from now on!

My colleagues and I in the leadership of this movement are in no doubt about our duty to those members who've elected us. It is to maintain at all costs the unity, the discipline and the fighting effectiveness of the National Front.

On the one hand we must defend the right of all members to dissent – to disagree with and criticise the leadership on occasions, to suggest improvements in the way that the party is run. We've no wish to stop this, and my door is always open to anyone who wishes to come to me and

Out of chaos — to strength and order

offer constructive criticism and advice.

But the moment that anyone tries to exploit disagreements in the party for the purpose of building factions that divide one part of the party from another – the moment that we see any sign of secret meetings, of factional publications, of any of the implements of subversion and disruption of the party, we shall deal with those developments with absolute ruthlessness, and those people responsible will find themselves outside the party so quickly they won't know what's hit them!

Our movement is now approaching its 10th Anniversary – 10 difficult years in which we've learned much. During those 10 years we've seemed at times to be unsure about exactly what sort of party we ought to be. I've encountered some people in the National Front who seem to think that we ought to be as much like the other parties as possible, that we ought to model ourselves on them. I've known some people join the National Front expecting it to be the same sort of rather futile, ineffective club and talking shop as the party they've just left. They seem to think we should have just the same spirit, structure and procedures as the other parties, but with just a bit more patriotic flavour – in other words, that we should not be basically any different from the institutions that have ruined Britain – the institutions that have made Britain a totally ineffective force in world affairs, an ill disciplined, incohesive rabble instead of a powerful and efficient nation.

VITAL MOMENT OF DECISION

I believe that our party has now come to a vital moment of decision – a moment when it must determine once and for all what shape and form it's going to take, and I have no doubt what shape and form that must be.

Events in our country – and in the world – are moving very fast. Every sign in the wind points to accelerating national collapse – collapse in every sector, politically, economically, morally. This collapse, if it comes, will only be the just culmination of more than half a century's mismanagement of our national affairs, of more than half a century in which we've totally failed to adapt our institutions to the demands of the modern world.

Probably even now political power in this country is in a vacuum – and effective authority has capitulated. That is to say, there is no effective and recognisable political authority any more. All we have is government going through the motions of governing – performing the ritual of government when the substance of real power lies elsewhere. This is happening on our streets; it's happening in our industries; it's happening in our so-called 'centres of learning'.

Politics as such have become a nest of corruption – with the Stonehouse affair merely the tip of the iceberg. Politics in this country have long ceased to be an honourable means of public service. They now offer scope only to the cheap careerist. For politicians, no great long-term national goals any longer exist – everything is a rat-race for the advantage of the moment, everything is a petty and squalid struggle for the vanities and the perks of office. The spirit of our times is one in which a politician is actually admired and respected most of all for his ability to lie and manoeuvre – a fact which makes Harold Wilson perhaps the most esteemed politician of the age. What kind of country a political leader leaves behind him is of no account. His stature depends on the expertise with which he performs all the twisting gyrations of staying in power, appeasing

his left-wing then his right, then the unions, then the City, then the International bankers, then God knows who else.

In this situation we will be guilty before history if we fail to understand what the voice of the British nation now cries out desperately for us to do, if we fail to perceive what the millions of our countrymen and women long for in their hearts.

They long for an end to all the petty day-to-day wangles of the old party game; they long for an end to weakness; they long for an end to compromise with the powers that have been wrecking this country; they long to see strong rulers come forward and take this country by the scruff of the neck and bring order, efficiency and unity back to national affairs.

In times like these, times of great decision and destiny, we have one duty above all else: it is to make our movement the instrument of steel needed to cut forward through all the chaos and conflict and grasp the reigns of power – real power and authority to transform this country and to rescue it from all the many forces of disruption that have crippled it for so long.

I cannot conceive of us doing this – I cannot conceive of us answering the call of our countrymen to restore leadership to Britain – if we now choose the path of weakness, the path of compromise, the path followed by the frightened little men who have presided over the twilight of a great empire.

Our movement has to be radically different, fundamentally different from all the institutions that have led this country to its present state, and that includes first and foremost the old political parties. We should not be ashamed of this difference; we should be proud of it, we should proclaim it from the rooftops for all to hear!

Often I hear among members of our movement discussion as to what is going to be the main issue that will eventually bring us to victory. At the present time there is no doubt that the main issue is race and immigration. Some of us believe that in time the main issue will become economic.

ONE THING ABOVE ALL ELSE

I have no doubt that all these issues will be important, but I believe that one thing above all else will win us the confidence and the respect of the British people in the course of time, and that will be our ability to project an image of ourselves as being the only movement in the land able to bring order from out of chaos.

Let us remember that only certain areas are touched by immigration. Let us also remember that on the questions of the economy the British electorate does not consist of experts or specialists; it is difficult for them as ordinary men and women to sort out one economic argument from another.

But there is one thing that the great majority of the electorate can immediately recognise – and they recognise it by instinct rather than by any form of intellectual understanding: that is, a party which has the strength and the will to govern and to rule. In normal times, times of prosperity and ease, times of security and comfort, the people may be a little bit afraid of such a party; they may prefer the doddering, lethargic old men that they know to the dynamic new men they don't know; they may opt for the safety of the old institutions rather than take the chance of giving power to virile new forces.

But in times of chaos and collapse, all this changes. The people long for order and they long

for strength, and they have this instinct for recognising the forces of order and strength and authority when they appear. Those forces which only a while ago made them nervous and apprehensive now appear as the only forces of deliverance.

Nearly all my adult life I've been a student of propaganda. And of one thing I'm utterly convinced: the image of strength is always the greatest propaganda weapon in times of chaos, in times of collapse, in times of the abdication of the old and established forms of authority. Political and economic and social theories are only capable of being understood by the very few — only by people who care to make themselves students of such things. The average man and woman has a much more basic and primitive way of responding to the appeal of a political party in a moment of crisis: does that party look as if it has the power and the will and the resolution to bring orderly government? Does it look as if it's prepared to confront and deal with those who've caused the chaos?

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Let's look for a moment, fellow members, at the Conservative Party. Let's look at the Conservative Party to see how it measures up to the situation in this country today.

The Conservatives met for their conference the other week in circumstances which should have been ideal for them. Britain under a Labour Government in perhaps her worst ever crisis; national bankruptcy; Government completely broken down; chaos everywhere. And everywhere we look, the threat that comes with chaos — the threat of Communism. We now have Reds in virtual control of the Labour Party as well as the unions. We have all the symptoms of revolution in this country.

And what did the Conservatives have to offer? What message rang out from the Tory Conference to rally the British people against these dangers?

The message was that we should all show 'moderation'. We should all keep to the 'middle of the road'. Avoid 'extremism' — especially the 'extremism' of the National Front! Put your trust in 'respectable', 'moderate' politicians and 'respectable', 'moderate' policies.

Now let's look back at the world over the last 60 years, since the Russian Revolution. During almost the whole of that 60 years Communism has been on the advance. It has won victory after victory.

And during almost the whole of that 60 years the Western World has been on the retreat. It's suffered defeat after defeat after defeat.

Only last month the Western World suffered yet another defeat. Rhodesia surrendered. And now Communist or near Communist regimes control almost the whole of Africa. Another triumph for Communism! Another defeat for the West! Another defeat for us!

Not only has this taken place on the world stage, it's taken place in Britain too. One after another national institution has collapsed and capitulated to Communism. The Labour Party's Communist. The Liberals are nearly Communist. The unions are Communist. The universities are practically Communist. The broadcasting services and the press are riddled with Reds.

Why have people who only represent a minority viewpoint, who are hated by most of the population, taken over these institutions, one-by-one? Why have the Communists taken over the countries of the world, one-by-one — without ever having won a properly constituted democratic election?

The Communists have won all these victories because they're a militant force — because they're ruthless, because they're hard, because they're fanatical, because they have an attitude of 'win at all costs', because they know no such thing as compromise, except in the purely tactical sense, because their very force and power strikes terror into their opponents.

And why has our side lost? Because we've

been weak. Because we've supported the politics of 'compromise' and 'moderation'. Because we've given ourselves up to the pursuit of 'respectability'!

The prescription that the Conservatives offer in this time of crisis and collapse is more weakness, more softness, more compromise. It's a prescription for further retreat, for further surrender. It's a prescription for the suicide of Britain and the suicide of the Western World!

When we see our country threatened with a take-over of this kind, we should not oppose it with 'moderation', we should be opposed to it in the extreme. When we see Reds wrecking our industries, we should oppose them in the extreme. When we see those same Reds taking over our schools, we should oppose them in the extreme. When we see Black muggers taking over our streets at night, when we see Black gangs attacking and injuring our policemen, we should oppose them in the extreme. When we see our country being invaded, we should oppose it to the absolute extreme!

When these things are happening to Britain, we should not be sitting muttering a few feeble protests, as a lot of the Tories do; we should not be making the occasional once-yearly speech about it; we should be out on the street, day-after-day, night-after-night, demonstrating, agitating, marching, rallying the people, raising hell up and down the country!

If the Conservatives think that we live in times when national problems can be tackled by parties comprised of waffling old women, relying on soft solutions which have failed and failed and failed again over half a century — if they think that 'moderation' and 'compromise' are now adequate to deal with the dangers besetting this country — then they totally misread the writing on the wall!

TIMES OF CHAOS AND VIOLENCE

The times ahead of us are not going to be times of calm but times of storm — not times of peace and order but times of chaos and violence. That may not be our wish, but it's a fact. It's a fact that's been decreed by the people who now threaten to take over this country. It's a fact wished by the mobs who now control our factories and our streets. It's a fact wished by the yahoo brigade that dominated the Labour Party conference. It's a fact wished by those who control student politics in this country. It's a fact wished by the arrogant leaders of 'Black Power' and other alien cults.

Before all this chaos and violence, the 'moderate' and 'respectable' people of this country have run like rabbits scuttling for their holes — funkholes in which they squat and look on as frightened spectators. We, and only we, have stood and fought!

Is it any wonder that all those who spread chaos and revolution in this country hate us with an intensity that's quite pathological? Is it any wonder that they attack us with a vituperation that knows no limits? They hate us and attack us because we're the one force in Britain that now stands between them and total victory — because we're the one force in Britain that they cannot frighten and they cannot destroy. Every so-called 'moderate' institution, every institution believing in compromise, 'respectability' and weakness, they've destroyed or they've frightened into submission — not us, not the National Front!

There is a phrase now going around Tory circles, which I think epitomises the spirit of that party today and the whole spirit of the old world of 'moderate', 'respectable' politics. The phrase is: 'Britain is becoming ungovernable'. I regard that phrase as being the voice of defeatism, the voice of abdication, the voice of tired, senile old men who've given up the ghost, who haven't the stomach for the fight.

Of course this country is governable! It's governable by men who have the will and the strength to govern. It's governable by men who are prepared to stand up to all the people who've been

wrecking this country for the past 10 or 20 years. This country is governable by men who don't waste time pussyfooting with Communism, but are prepared to smash Communism wherever it raises its head — prepared to smash Communism, smash the IRA and everyone else who's against Britain.

This country is governable by men who are prepared to stop pandering to every base and lazy impulse in the British people and once again rally the British people to great goals and great tasks.

This country is governable by men who believe in the great destiny of the British nation, who believe in the capacity of the British people for greatness, who can answer the yearning of all nations and all peoples in times of crisis and chaos: the yearning for leadership — the yearning for men of decision and will. For men who will take command.

Britain is only ungovernable today because those who are supposed to govern have thrown in the towel — they've capitulated because they're too weak and too tired and too cowardly to lead and to rule. Britain can be governed, and can be restored to power and strength, when the will to live of the British people re-asserts itself again. Today that will resides in one party and one party alone: THE NATIONAL FRONT!

CLAIM YOUR MEDALS FOR REMEMBRANCE DAY

Ex-servicemen can claim their medals for the National Front Remembrance Day parade from:

ARMY

Army Medal Office, Government Buildings, Droitwich, Worcestershire.

R.A.F.

R.A.F. Personnel Management Centre, Barnwood, Gloucester.

NAVY

H.M.S. Centurion, Gosport, Hants.

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British Views Letter

founded by

A. K. Chesterton

Published by Candour Publishing Co.

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

READ

National Front News

A broadsheet published monthly in support of the National Front. Subscriptions only, for 5 copies or more. 12 issues of 5 copies, £4.08.

Reduced rates for bulk supplies given on request. Send 11½p for sample copy now.

S. E. D. BROWN

Liberals — Fifth Columnists of Communism

Reprinted in an abridged form with acknowledgements to The South African Observer.

WHAT the West does not seem to realise is that the monstrous thing that has befallen Eastern Europe in the name of Communism is no different from the monstrous thing that is fast befalling the West, in the name of socialism, internationalism, world brotherhood and Liberalism.

On all sides we see the steady chipping away of the bulwarks of our civilization, and the tragedy of it is that there are so many Liberals who join in this treason; join in it, in fact, with a fanatical zeal.

Communists are skilled enough in warfare to know that their goal can be approached in different ways. They know that some nations are still too "backward" to look with an enthusiastic eye upon the collectivizing of their economy. These nations must be edged toward it by indirect methods. And the Communist tactic now most aggressively used in the West, and in South Africa, is the approach through the idea of racial integration and collectivism.

The Communist attitude toward race — like that of the Liberals — stems from Communism's materialistic representation of man, which has always had as one of its cardinal tenets the dogma that there are no real differences between people except economic differences. They accordingly hold: "Remove the economic differences and all the others — racial, cultural, social and moral — will disappear."

This phase of the levelling or obliterating process, which is also the policy of the Liberals, is now being presented with a great deal of moral unction. They call it the "Unity of Mankind".

Of course, they never make clear what they mean by the phrase. Nor do they ever define the other clichés which makeup their vocabulary — clichés such as 'brotherhood', 'democracy', 'equality', 'fundamental human rights', 'social justice', 'peace', 'progress', 'new thinking', 'new world', and all the other demoralizing jargon which goes to make up "world opinion".

All the the man-in-the-street is permitted to know is that "liberals" have "morality" and "world opinion" on their side. He must not suspect that their "morality" is a figment imagined by persons who have openly repudiated morals, and that "world opinion" is what is created when a few "liberal" journalists in one country use the favourite clichés of a few journalists in another.

The man-in-the-street is certainly not told that the "unity of mankind", "fundamental human rights", and similar clichés are

designed to lead him blindfolded up the path of international socialism, to strip him of his racial and national character, and finally to destroy his dignity and integrity as an individual human being.

The menace of the "Liberal" lies precisely in the fact that behind the elaborate facade of his high-sounding clichés — sophistries cleverly designed to eradicate the concept of racial integrity and national sovereignty, and to strip Western man of his racial and national character, making of him a rootless cosmopolitan for whom life has become meaningless — all "liberal" activities are purposive and co-ordinated.

Their activities lead straight toward their goal of "One World: One Race", and "One World: One Government" — which cannot be anything but a materialistic totalitarianism, a monstrous and a barbarous tyranny. This is precisely the goal of the Communist Conspiracy.

And as self-appointed keepers of the "world conscience", they think it "in-human" and in the worst nationalist taste to mention the fact that when force is used to build paradises — multiracial, socialist, communist or other — there are inevitable consequences. Millions of poor wretches have already been savagely slaughtered and starved to death to build the 'socialist' paradises in Russia and China — and millions more will continue to be slaughtered to maintain those and other paradises.

The price of "social justice", in short, is massacre.

This helps to explain why "liberals", although always professing to be anti-Communist, are almost invariably found in the ranks of the militant anti-anti-Communists.

For just as "liberals", though forever quarrelling among themselves, hold basic beliefs which co-ordinate their efforts to undermine and destroy the fibre, integrity, and organic unity of every Western nation, so their quarrels with Communist theory do not prevent them from finding themselves on common ground with the Communists.

Like the sunflower to the sun, the "liberal" always turns to the Left.

That is why, whenever a nation seeks to preserve itself by investigating and exposing the Communist Conspiracy, the tender-minded "liberals" immediately mobilize themselves to defend traitors, subversives and yes, also murderers.

Despite their verbose wrangling with Communists over the details of theory, the "liberals" are always drawn toward Communism because, cutting themselves off from their own culture, they have no place else to go.

They are themselves persons who have turned their backs on, and are traitors to, their own people, their own kind, and their own traditions. They are inevitably lined up with the enemies of their nation and their race.

If we look beyond their "liberal"

verbiage and their professions of good intentions, which are doubtless sincere — and since there need be no connection between cause and effect in their dream-world — if we look beyond these to the results of their "liberal" action, we see four cardinal facts:

- (1) Contemporary "Liberalism", like Communism, denies the validity of absolute moral values, whether arrived at prescriptively or rationally;
- (2) "Liberalism", like Communism, rejects the spiritual bases upon which the unique being of the individual person is founded, and with that rejection it destroys the philosophical foundation which is the *sine qua non* of a free society;
- (3) "Liberalism", like Communism, applies to social and political realities the mad and impious schemes of the "social engineers" who, with calculation and the violence of centralized power, would dam, confine, control, and direct the free rhythms of human life. They abrogate the laws of nature and abolish the design of God; and therefore,
- (4) Contemporary "liberalism" and Communism are, in effect, forces of the same revolutionary movement.

The only significant difference is that the "liberal" may not know where he is going, the Communist does.

The threats of contemporary Liberalism and Communism are not merely threats to Western civilization and Western culture, they are threats to every civilization and every culture.

In short, they are not only enemies of nations but quite simply of the human race and, as such, the enemies of God and of all human achievement.

They want nothing less from us than our complete surrender to their one-world, equalitarian, collectivist ideology.

In this struggle we are facing the worst extremists. To win, we cannot afford the luxury of tolerance and timidity — or of any relaxation in our principles and policies. Our very survival is at stake!

In fighting them, we no longer fight only for the freedom of nations, but for the freedom of the human being. And so, for all who want to remain free human beings, there can be no choice.

We must remember that seventy years ago, there were only a handful of Communists. Today, without ever having fought a war for Communism, or in the name of Communism, they hold in subjugation more than 1,000 million people in the world!

And how have they done it? Every inch of their way has been paved by present-day "liberals".

We must seek a practical solution — one which will follow not only the Communists, but the proliferating Liberals into their holes, after the manner of ferrets.

We must be sinuous. We must be lethal. We must be as merciless as the deadly creatures who seek to destroy our White race, our nations and our civilization.

Why are the knives out for Gen. George Brown?

GENERAL George S. Brown, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the armed forces of the United States of America, is at the very top of his profession.

To hold his command he must not only have an extensive grasp of the military craft, but also an intimate knowledge of what is what and who is who in the field of national and international politics, diplomacy and business. His job is to ensure that America is able at all times to defend itself and its vital interests anywhere on the globe.

He was, so far as we can tell, promoted to his command on the basis of merit. He does not hold an elected office, thus he does not have to pander to the whims and ignorance of the mob, as do his political masters. He is, so far as we know, an honourable man in the best traditions of an honourable service.

All this qualifies him as a man whose statements, on matters which come within his professional scope, should be listened to with attention and respect by all — especially the average Establishment politician of the Atlantic, whose ignorance and incapacity is only exceeded by a craven desire to do anything that might attract preferment.

STRAIGHT-TALKING

Gen. Brown is a straight-thinking, straight-talking (and probably straight-shooting) 'True Grit' WASPish son of all that was fine in America before it degenerated — as our poor Britain has done — into a disunited, usury-bled, cosmopolitanised Babylonian garbage heap.

Authoritative straight-talkers will inevitably be unpopular with Establishment politicians in our sham democracy who live in and off a world of weasel words, lies, humbug and behind-the-scenes patronage, like the proverbial 'bugs in a rug'.

They do not like it when the likes of blunt Gen. Brown come along and give the rug a good shake, causing them to fall to the floor, wriggling and blinking with embarrassment in the glare of simple truth.

Not long ago Gen. Brown's frankness got him into trouble when he declared that America was putting herself into a dangerous and crippling expensive military posture in the Middle East in the service of no tangible American national interest.

This situation had come about, he indicated, because the paymasters of America's Zionist movement controlled America's banking institutions, and through these the whole economy of the nation.

They used their economic power to force successive American governments to support Israel come what may, even if the economic or military effects on America were detrimental.

TRUTH "ANTI-SEMITIC"

This was a simple, direct, unarguable statement of FACT. It was a statement that the Chairman of the U.S. armed forces Joint Chiefs of Staff was duty-bound to make in a democracy where all public officials are accountable to the public — and Gen. Brown is employed by the American people to organise their defence.

Immediately, the body politic and the media erupted with howls of rage. This was hardly to be wondered at as all high-flying American politicians are massively dependent on the financial patronage of the Zionist big money boys; as all the main American T.V. networks are owned and controlled by Zionists; and as all major newspapers that are not directly owned by Zionists (and most are) are influenced by them — the major purchasers of advertising space being Zionist-owned monopolistic companies.

None of the howlers tried to prove that what Gen. Brown had said about Zionist power over America was incorrect. How could they? It is as plain as the nose on the face of the Statue of Liberty — as obvious as the crack in the Liberty Bell!

All the howlers howled was "Anti-Semitism! Anti-Semitism!"

If there is any meaning to be deduced from the shouting of such a slogan, it is that if 'anti-Semitism' could comprise truthful statements made by an honourable, objective, well-informed public servant about how Zionists in America use their power, then the Zionists must be doing something which they know would be seen as improper by the majority of their non-Zionist Gentile fellow citizens.

MEDIA PANIC

Therefore, Zionists must be seeking to obscure their activities so that the majority will not become alarmed and take action to protect themselves (i.e. more "anti-Semitism") and this is the reason why Zionists were enraged by Gen. Brown's statement.

If the Zionists are so powerful, it might be asked, why didn't he get the sack for speaking out? The answer is because the General cleverly did not give advance warning of his exposé. The media people,

caught off-guard, panicked and gave his comments — albeit with lots of abuse — terrific publicity.

That initial thoughtless publicity was the General's protection, for were he to have been victimised it would unavoidably have come to public attention — he having been made a figure of public interest by the media — and his point about Zionist power would have been confirmed in many minds.

But Zionists do not forgive and forget. For them, the nurturing of a hate and then the enactment of revenge is an ecstatic tribal rite. Gen. Brown was another Haman — and they would have his ears — but they felt constrained to wait for an opportunity to destroy him in a way that the stupid masses would not guess who had pressed the button, and why.

Their time of opportunity came this October when Gen. Brown made another rather blunt speech — this time about the state of Britain's armed forces. He lamented the decline of British military power.

Britain's armed forces were, he said, "pathetic" in comparison not just to their former glory, but in relation to the role they are supposed to fulfil in NATO. Our armed services, he felt, were little more than a "collection of generals, admirals and bands".

ZIONIST REVENGE?

In no way were Gen. Brown's comments about our forces "anti-British", any more than his previous pronouncements about the Zionists were "anti-Semitic". As a military expert he gave his informed and objective opinion.

If anything, his remarks were pro-British as he made it clear that he wished Britain to have substantial and effective defence forces. His point of view in that regard is endorsed by *Spearhead* and the National Front.

However it quickly became clear that the press on both sides of the Atlantic, and politicians identified with the Zionist cause, were orchestrated in a campaign to misrepresent what Gen. Brown had said by portraying his constructive criticism as a "scornful attack", so that he would appear to be the cause of a diplomatic incident.

In Britain our cynical and utterly un-British press, which has kept the British people asleep for years while successive governments progressively decimated our armed forces, suddenly became super-patriots and super-militarists, as they sounded off about Gen. Brown's "slur".

In America the press became suddenly, movingly, pro-British. "How dare Gen. Brown insult our dearest friend and ally! . . . Gen. Brown has undermined NATO! . . . Gen. Brown is a diplomatic disaster area — he will have to go!"

"Yes, yes!" muttered a chorus of thick Kissinger voices echoing from Wall Street to Miami Beach. "Gen. Brown is *anti-British*, already! He'll have to go!"

THE OUTCOME of the American Presidential election will be known as this issue of *Spearhead* goes to press. So far as the International Financial Establishment is concerned, it does not really matter who wins — as usual they have backed both candidates. The purpose of this article is simply to look at how they produced the Democratic party contender, and why.

The democratic 'choice' in the 1976 Presidential election consisted in the fact that the electorate could have either Nelson Rockefeller's man, Ford, or David Rockefeller's man, Carter! A Republican win would not only mean the election of President Ford (who is a member of Nelson Rockefeller's "One World" Commission on Critical Choices), but also Rockefeller employee Henry Kissinger in charge of foreign policy, and Nelson Rockefeller himself as Vice-President and head of the Domestic Council. A Democratic win would not simply mean the election of President Carter (who is a member of David Rockefeller's "One World" Trilateral Commission), but also Rockefeller employee Zbigniew Brzezinski, architect of the Trilateral Commission, in charge of foreign policy.

With everyone earnestly debating the respective merits of Ford and Carter, Nelson and David must have had quite a good laugh.

The emergence of Jimmy Carter as the Democratic candidate, however, was certainly the International Establishment's master stroke. Should the Republicans lose the election, Vice-President Nelson Rockefeller as well as Henry Kissinger would both lose office. Certainly, power does not rest in office alone. Nevertheless, the loss of it would still be something of a set-back for the planned One World Merger.

There is an increasing amount of evidence which suggests that the conspiratorial Insiders deliberately contrived the removal of Nixon through the Watergate affair so as to promote their man Nelson Rockefeller to the Presidency. American columnist Paul Scott wrote at the time: "The drama-packed Senate Watergate hearings are only the colourful sideshow to one of the boldest and slickest transfers in U.S. history". He continued:

"With everyone's attention focused on the cast of 'small time' actors parading before the TV cameras recording the special Senate inquiry, only a few privileged insiders are alert to the really big show taking place at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

"As part of the plan to create a new world order, the main show involves the carefully planned transfer of power from President Nixon to New York's Governor Rockefeller, now strategically positioning himself to become the President's heir apparent for 1976.

"Whether Rockefeller with his family's vast economic wealth, social and political power will be able to pull off this carefully managed 'power grab' is one of the most chilling and exciting political stories un-

RICHARD VERRALL


The making of a President ... or two

folding in our times."

Yes, indeed! A great deal of effort by the architects of the "new world order" obviously went into the removal of Nixon (who had served his purpose) and the convenient appointment of Rockefeller (who failed three times to get elected) as Vice-President and heir apparent. Such control in the hands of the Money Power would be just that big greater than the behind-the-scenes control they have always enjoyed.

SETTING UP AN ALTERNATIVE

But conspirators like these know better than to put all their eggs in one basket. The Republican Party, to which Rockefeller and Kissinger nominally owe their allegiance, could still lose a future election. It was therefore necessary to ensure that, in such an event, the Democratic alternative was as committed to the One World objectives of the financial oligarchy as the oligarchy itself, and in Jimmy Carter they



BRZEZINSKI
Key adviser
behind
Carter

certainly produced their man — probably the most highly perfected political machine ever manufactured by the behind-the-scenes power mongers. As much effort went into the creation of Carter as went into the planting of Rockefeller one step from the Presidency.

Carter, the simple peanut farmer, was picked for this role quite early on. Lawrence Stern of the *Washington Post* reported:

"Until 1973, Carter's credentials in foreign policy matters were limited . . . Late in the fall of 1973, he was invited to dine in London with David Rockefeller of the Chase Manhattan Bank during one of his trade promotion visits. Rockefeller, with the help of Zbigniew Brzezinski, was then establishing the Trilateral Commission, which has become a prestigious forum that has included in its membership the leading businessmen, political leaders and foreign policy intellectuals of North America, Western Europe and Japan".

Yet another forum of the international

bankers! What does it do? An executive arm of the Bilderberg Group perhaps? Whatever its precise function, it is certainly a mortal enemy of nationhood and an important part of the machinery that is grinding the formation of a World Government. Its stated purpose is to abolish the "narrow dictates of national interest" in favour of building a "new economic world order". This, of course, is no different from Henry Kissinger's "World Community" which is planned to enslave the nations, and yet the American voting fodder are treated to elaborate explanations of how Jimmy Carter is fervently opposed to Kissinger's foreign policy.

According to the Italian magazine *Europea*, the purpose of the 1973 meeting with Rockefeller, although called on the pretext of discussing commercial matters, was in fact to give Rockefeller the opportunity of sizing up potential Presidential candidates. Carter was approved. Peter Bourne, one of Carter's chief aides, has admitted that even as early as 1970 David Rockefeller and Brzezinski "immediately agreed that Carter was the ideal politician to build on".

And built on he certainly was. *Europea* reported that Brzezinski designed the Trilateral Commission to be "the most powerful group of intellectual and political powers the world has ever seen". From it a project would be launched, "the most brilliant, the most unthinkable of all, to create . . . a magnificent political robot and point it straight into the White House. This superb creation would be — Jimmy Carter".

After foreign policy lessons from the Trilateral Commission, the peanut farmer was then whisked off to be indoctrinated by the other agencies set up by the global planners, and to know their ways of the world. The *Washington Post* described it as extending "his range of contacts in the foreign policy establishment". First stop was the sinister Council on Foreign Relations (president, David Rockefeller), where for the last forty years the international financiers have designed policies and trained their political stooges in internationalism before passing them on to all key Government positions. It was in the course of this crash programme in One World-ism that Carter picked up such high-powered C.F.R. advisers as Averell Harriman, Richard Gardner, Paul Warnke (who favours far-reaching concessions to the Soviet Union at SALT talks) and Bilderberg regular, Paul Nitze.

"ERODING NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY"

Carter adviser and C.F.R. man Richard

Gardner, a former State Department official, is one of those few people to have spelled out exactly what the world planners have in store for us. He stated in a speech:

"We are likely to do better by building our 'house of world order' from the bottom up rather than from the top down. It will look like a great 'booming, buzzing confusion', to use William James' facetious description of reality; but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, is likely to get us to world order faster than the old-fashioned frontal assault."

So these are the kind of people who trained Carter for the Presidency! Anyone still in doubt about a global conspiracy for World Government?

A useful introduction that Carter acquired through the Council on Foreign Relations, whose members control the media, was to the director of Time Inc., Sol Myron Linowitz. He obliged with *Time* magazine's propaganda campaign to promote Carter as "the new Kennerdy".

Next stop for Carter was the Brookings Institution, described by the *Washington Post* as "a factory of expertise on foreign and domestic policy issues central to a Presidential campaign . . . At Brookings, Carter was squired from expert to expert in the building that serves as one of the nation's leading public policy centres . . ." From Brookings, Carter came away with one of his economic advisers, one Joseph Pechman.

At the end of all this high-powered education by the agencies of the "new world order", Carter had acquired an impressive array of those minority "advisers" essential to anyone who aspires to the top in politics: Brzezinski on foreign policy; Warnke and Nitze on defence; Lawrence Klein on the economy and C. Fred Bergsten on foreign monetary affairs; Jerome Cohen on the Far East and Ruth Morgenthau on African affairs; Alvin Weinberg on energy; Joseph Pechman on taxation and Frank Ochberg on health. Top Kennerdy aide and "foreign policy expert" Frank Mankiewicz also joined the Carter campaign.

The whole team is co-ordinated by a certain Stuart Eizenstat, formerly an adviser to Lyndon Johnson, whose job is to programme Carter with the answers on just about everything. "He knows whom to ask to perform on any given issue when Carter needs an analysis, an answer or a full-blown policy", according to an article in the *Sunday Times*. Carter's legal advisers are Morris Dees and Joe Levine, who look set for important Justice Department posts in the event of a Carter win. No less a person than Dr. William Wexler, formerly international president of B'nai B'rith, provided the final seal of internationalist approval by heading the "Jews for Carter" organisation.

As A. K. Chesterton used to say — You've got to hand it to them. A sprinkling of Americans were added in the shape of people like Paul Austin, president of the


Coca-Cola Corporation. "He is as convinced an internationalist as only a man selling a global product can be", according to the Washington correspondent of the *Sunday Times*, and is "well respected in the business community".

INTEGRATION WITH COMMUNIST BLOC

Carter, polished, programmed and propelled towards the Presidency, was now ready. He even gave proof of his new learning to his new masters by addressing the Council on Foreign Relations in Chicago on the necessity to replace "balance-of-power politics with world-order politics" (i.e. replace nations with a World Government).

The key man behind Carter is Zbigniew Brzezinski, Rockefeller's architect of the Trilateral Commission — he is known as "David's Kissinger" — and head of the "Research Institute on International Change". Brzezinski would be certain to replace Kissinger as the top foreign policy man in a Carter administration.

The incredible fraud that has been perpetrated throughout the election was the portrayal of Carter as highly critical of Kissinger's global strategy and of the appease-



EIZENSTAT
Provides
Carter's
answers

ment of the Soviet Union in the Helsinki surrender agreement. In the widely televised debate between the two contestants, Carter loudly denounced the Helsinki agreement as a betrayal of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

The truth is, however, that his key adviser Brzezinski is indeed critical of Kissinger — only because the Helsinki agreement did not go far enough! He advocates almost immediate integration with the Communist bloc, a policy he enunciated as early as 1966 when he called for "a bold commitment by the U.S. to the peaceful reconciliation of Eastern and Western Europe in which Russia would join . . ." Brzezinski and Kissinger are agreed on the aims — they differ merely on tactics. Brzezinski favours a much speedier programme of integration towards World Government than Kissinger's 'softly-softly' *detente* approach.

It is interesting that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) were set up during the Lyndon Johnson administration. Numerous current Carter advisers, including Brzezinski, Eizenstat and Harold Brown (C.F.R.) were policy planners in the Johnson

administration. The purpose of the conspirators in setting up the SALT talks was to restrict American armament while allowing the Soviet Union to catch up through hidden concessions, thus facilitating integration for the sake of 'peace'. This plan has been carried out very nicely by Dr. Kissinger and his fellow alien underling, Helmut Sonnenfeldt.

CONSPIRATORIAL POWER DRIVE

Spearhead has commented with some frequency on the media's obsession with American presidential elections which, in the way they are presented, are of little interest to the British public and which dwell on the trivia of personalities. What we are concerned with here is the clearest revelation, which American politics above all provide, of the hidden hand of that sinister financial Establishment whose ultimate ambition is the creation of a tyrannical World State over the grave of nationhood.

This Establishment is a permanent and unchanging power in international affairs, and by the means of money it rules whether the Fords and Carters, Nixons and Johnsons win or lose. As Guy de Rothschild put it: "We will change, evolve, but will still dominate". Who rules in name simply does not matter. Those who wonder why the West has moved continually in a collectivist, internationalist, multi-racialist and pro-communist direction, irrespective of what party happens to be the "government" anywhere, have their answer.

The United States today is the centre of this conspiratorial power drive, though an article in next month's issue will make it clear that the network has long been in existence, operating in various levels in various Western nations. Because America is today the dominant Western power, dominating America is the key to dominating the West and its relationship with World Communism. That is why the Money Power is based in America, and why its machinations are more clearly revealed in the politics of that nation.

But it is not only there that International Finance wields its control and exercises its unique brand of dual patronage. We all remember the charade of abuse heaped on each other at their respective conferences by Conservative leader Mrs. Thatcher and Labour Chancellor Denis Healey. Yet at a secret meeting in Turkey held by the "One World" Bilderberg Group conspirators, they sat down together quite amicably. What for? To debate the merits of nationalising British industry — or to be told by the Bilderbergers which way Britain and the Western world is going over the next ten years? It could not possibly have been to slate each other over the latest IMF loan. That is merely for public consumption, and after all, representatives of that august body were seated at the table with them.

TRANSPORT, ENERGY AND NATIONALISM

The author is a senior project engineer with the Motor Industry Research Association, and an authority on electric vehicular transport.

SOME OF THE greatest visible achievements of past and present nationalist governments are to be seen today in the fields of transport and energy. These two vital areas of national concern should be given high priority in future policy statements of the National Front.

Pre-war German, Italian and Spanish National governments, as well as post-war Spanish, Rhodesian and South African governments, have given a lead to the world in transport innovation and energy management, both in the military and civilian spheres. In the 1930's Germany built the first autobahns and conceived the Volkswagen as the first single model small car, to be built later in millions outside the United States. In the field of aviation Germany was the first with the jet engine to be installed in experimental Heinkel prototypes in 1939. Her rocket developments need no reminding, except to mention that they were the forerunners of today's satellites and space probes. In the naval sphere, owing to the Versailles treaty which put a weight limit of 10,000 tons on any ship of war that Germany might build, she pioneered all-welded steel hull construction of large ships to save weight.

On a much smaller scale, pre-war Italy also made advances in aviation and road building. She constructed strategic roads in Libya, Ethiopia and Somaliland, where none had been built before. The best remembered of these was the Via Balbia, vital to both sides during the Desert Campaign.

Before Franco came to power, Spain had very poor roads and railways. Towards the end of the Civil War he had built military roads southwards from Bilbao to Madrid and on down to Cadiz and Granada. With the post-war tourist boom, much of the foreign currency earned was used to improve the whole road and rail network in Spain — as any casual tourist will have noticed during the last 15 years. In the ship building industry, Spain was fifth largest in the world during 1974-75, overtaking both Britain and West Germany in this respect.

Outside Europe, Rhodesia and South Africa have the best road and rail systems in the whole of Africa. Rhodesian railways, partly owing to trade sanctions, are the most efficient in the world in terms of tonnage carried per track mile per year. When it became clear that her outlets to Beira through Mozambique would be closed, Rhodesia built 90 miles of new railway through virgin bush

towards the South African border in less than a year!

Well before the last war Italy embarked on ambitious hydro-electric schemes in the Alps and Appenines, due to her shortage of coal and oil and the old League of Nations trade sanctions against her. These schemes still supply a large proportion of her electricity requirements today. There were at the same time parallel hydro-electric developments in Germany, although Germany was self sufficient in coal. What Germany lacked was oil, which all had to be imported from Rumania and Russia. As a contingency plan she set up plants for making synthetic oil from coal, using the Fischer-Tropsch process. It was the selective bombing of these plants that helped to bring Germany to her knees in 1944-45.

During the 1940's Spain built a network of dams for irrigation and hydro-electricity generation. Today these plants provide nearly half her electricity requirements, producing more hydro-electric power than Switzerland, which is an astonishing achievement for a country with low rainfall, and is an object lesson in water management in these recent years of British droughts.

In Africa, both Rhodesia and South Africa have huge hydro-electric generating capacity, although a few coal fired power stations are still used. When the old Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was in existence, they had the foresight to locate the power station on the Rhodesian side of the Zambesi, when the Kariba dam project was completed in 1960. Zambia still has to import most of her electricity from Rhodesia because of this early decision.

South Africa is well endowed with most energy resources except oil. Up till recently she had access to the Angolan oil fields at Cabinda, and has made promising discoveries within her own territory. If necessary she could always re-open her synthetic oil plants, which supplied 15% of her petroleum needs under the threat of trade sanctions in the early 1960's. The Orange river project fulfils most of South Africa's electricity requirements and she has at least one operational nuclear power station, being one of the world's largest sources of uranium.

FUTURE BRITISH TRANSPORT

British transport and energy policies should be compatible with regional requirements and a drive towards national self sufficiency.

In the field of transport new vehicle operations should be developed which make

use of indigenous fuels, with minimum maintenance of the media of movement. In this respect more attention should be paid to coastal and inland waterway transport, as well as more effective use of the existing railway system, with no more cut-backs in total rail mileage. A feasibility study should be carried out on hovercraft container carriers and short take-off and landing aircraft of large carrying capacity over short to medium range distances.

The juggernauts which crowd our roads must be severely restricted to preserve our British way of life in town and country, confining them to motorways and dual carriageways. More money should be spent on research into electric vehicles and advanced battery systems, since electric vehicles hold out the promise of using renewable energy sources indefinitely as well as being quiet and non-polluting. Diesel powered private cars should be encouraged by favourable tax-relief, because of their greater fuel economy and long life.

Rural transport needs revitalising and one suggestion would be to combine parcel delivery and postal collection with regular minibus services, siting bus stops at existing post boxes wherever possible.

Turning briefly to immigrant repatriation, it is an uncomfortable fact that our appalling immigrant problem has been aided by white man's transport. Those airlines, shipping companies, charter operators and tour operators who painted a rosy picture of Britain to immigrants already here have a lot to answer for in this respect. When the time comes for a programme of immigrant repatriation, are we to be content to allow immigrants and their families to leave our shores as and when they please by ordinary scheduled transport? Surely not. Massive organisation will be necessary.

SELF-SUFFICIENT IN ENERGY

In the drive towards national self sufficiency we must look increasingly towards renewable energy resources. Valuable as our coal and North Sea oil and gas reserves are, they will not last for ever, particularly the oil and gas. North Sea oil is high quality oil — it can almost be used in diesel engines unrefined — but it is expensive oil, unlike our natural gas reserves which at present are our cheapest form of non-renewable energy. Coal will continue to be used in our power stations and increasingly for making chemicals as oil reserves diminish. But it must be mined much more efficiently than at present, to be competitive with other forms of energy. It is possible that synthetic oil could be made again from coal, as it was in pre-war Germany and post-war South Africa.

In the nuclear energy field, when the first atomic power station was completed at Calder Hall in 1955, we were promised that nuclear power would solve our energy problems for the future. Today, 21 years

Contd. on page 15, col. 2

RHODESIA: THE ANATOMY OF WHITE SURRENDER

Contd. from page 7

it was not a racial war. Asked to demonstrate Rhodesia's social and economic achievements, they seemed more eager to demonstrate what those achievements had done for the Blacks than what they had done for the Whites.

All this was of course sheer humbug — good old evangelistic British humbug, which the world has long recognised as one of our main national traits. Of course there is much less idealism and much more self-interest in that sort of talk than might appear on the surface. It has, however, served always to obscure from the eyes of White Rhodesians the main *raison d'être* for their presence in the country, which has been, or should have been, the extension of the borders, and the maintenance of the power and wealth, of the White Race, particularly the British race. Had this principle been firmly implanted in the White Rhodesian mind, the will to hold on would have acquired an extra dimension that might have been decisive.

BELIEVING THEIR OWN WORDS

Rather than assert this, Rhodesian leaders, and to a great extent South African leaders too, have attempted to justify their position within liberal terms of reference. It seems that many of them have ended up believing their own words.

Rhodesia has now fallen, like Imperial Russia before it, not because it was too harsh, too authoritarian, too intolerant of its enemies within, but on the contrary because it was too mild, too liberal, too tolerant, too prone to compromise.

The guiding ethic of Rhodesia was not that of a revolutionary racial nationalist creed of the 20th Century but that of British Conservatism in its more gentlemanly years. Its watchword was moderation, respectability, the bourgeois virtues — albeit transplanted into a largely rural and tropical environment. It had all the elderly decency of the one-time British establishment, with its public school virtues of honour, fair play and the rule of law — and its very weak instinct for survival.

Now it has opted to go the way of that establishment — the honourable path to extinction with its head held erect and its hands unsoiled, the dignified withdrawal rather than the animal fight.

The war that has destroyed Rhodesia will not spare us; it is on our doorsteps and in our streets; the enemy is the same; the issues the same, the spoils of battle the same. Will we learn the lesson at this eleventh hour that there is no middle way between total victory and total annihilation? And will we recognise that to attain victory we must be not the rearguard of the old world but the vanguard of the new?

TRANSPORT, ENERGY AND NATIONALISM *contd. from page 14*

later, nuclear energy supplies only 6 per cent of our electricity needs, due to technical and economic problems with the reactors. We are now told that fast breeder reactors are the answer, and on paper they promise cheap electricity in the short-run. But even fast breeder reactors cannot last indefinitely, and like other natural resources the primary fuel, uranium, is becoming scarcer and more costly to mine, besides the fact that Britain has to import most of her uranium supplies. This means that Britain must conserve her uranium in the long run and set it aside for military requirements only.

However, the greatest potential for the future lies in so-called free energy sources such as wind, wave and tidal power with which Britain is well endowed. Hydro-electric power has already been developed in Scotland because of the urgent need for cheap electricity to manufacture aluminium, vital in aircraft construction during the last war and in the military and civil aircraft industries ever since. But there is sinister evidence that successive governments have dragged their feet in the development of these new resources, mainly due to the powerful National Union of Mineworkers' lobby with their sponsored left wing M.P.s, and the illusion of cheap oil shattered by the devastating Arab oil price rises in 1973.

The latest "contribution" to Government thinking is the unpublished report by a certain John Allen of the Energy Technology Support Unit at Harwell, which suggests that wind power is unlikely to provide significant amounts of energy in

the foreseeable future, whereas many independent experts, notably from the Electrical Research Association, calculate that wind power could provide almost half Britain's energy needs by the end of the century. Meanwhile America, Canada and even tiny Denmark are spending millions forging ahead of Britain in wind power generator construction and development.

The same almost criminal foot-dragging is apparent in assessing the Bristol Channel tidal energy scheme, which many experts estimate could provide a third of the nation's electricity needs. Instead the Government allows the world's best tidal energy site to go untapped, whilst France shows the way with her own tidal energy scheme in the Rance estuary at St. Malo, which has been producing electricity for a number of years now. Again, wave power shows great promise, especially off the Scottish coastline, but not a single item of working hardware has been produced — it is all theory and no action. To administer these new sources of energy would require the Central Electricity Generating Board to become much more decentralised, or else new Boards would have to be set up on the lines of the existing North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board.

It is in these areas of renewable energy source that a future National Front Government could make a profound impact on the nation, to the benefit of Britain as a whole, with the necessary political drive and direction.

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

IF OVERSEAS, SEALED OR UNSEALED

SURFACE MAIL OR AIR MAIL

RATES (12 issues):


British Isles:	£2.58
Overseas surface mail:	£2.52 unsealed
	£4.68 sealed
Overseas air mail:	£4.74 Canada, U.S.A., S. America,
(unsealed)	Africa, Middle East
	£5.34 Australia, New Zealand, Far East

Discounts can be obtained for bulk purchases as follows: —

20—49 copies:	11p each
50—99 copies:	9p each
100—249 copies:	8p each
250 copies and over:	6p each

PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply as above if remittance is by international money order; if remittance is by cheque an additional charge of 25p applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CRO 2QF, Surrey. If receipt is required, please enclose S.A.E.



SIR: Having just watched on TV the Chief Constable of Kent explaining why the ILLEGAL pop festival recently held on his 'manor' cost the ratepayers of that unfortunate county £200,000, one realises that the old saying "Those whom the Gods wish to destroy they first make mad" is truer than ever.

It appears that this poor man had to obey orders from our spineless Home Secretary 'Jelly' Jenkins and allow the drug soaked riff-raff to deliberately hold their ILLEGAL gathering. He was only allowed to tell them that "they should not really be there". It was clear from the interview that he would have liked to forbid the rabble to assemble, but he had received orders not to harrass the shower of drop-outs.

What an excellent idea if, in future, when such ILLEGAL gatherings are allowed by our venomous Home Secretary, the man responsible and his chief minions should be forced to pay the cost themselves instead of it falling upon the hapless taxpayers.

OLIVER GILBERT
Worthing, Sussex

SIR: With reference to a recent "What We Think" item, Caligula made his horse a Consul, not a Pro-consul. I have always rather liked Caligula for that. It expressed his well-merited disgust with the degenerate Romans of the first century. It is a pity more of our own politicians don't have "horse sense". Caligula also expressed the wish that the Roman people had one neck so that he could wring it. I wouldn't want to go quite that far, but I must confess that I have often wished that the British people had one collective posterior so that I (or someone) could kick it. At least it might wake them up.

There is some truth, after all, in the hard saying that a people gets the government it deserves, and the fact is that the British people since 1905 have elected one government after another of incompetents, fools, rogues and outright malevolent traitors, and, generally speaking, each successive government has been worse than the one before. It is true that the British

people have been, and are being, deceived by the media, but that is only a partial excuse. Obviously, there have always been a number who were not so deceived and have struggled to propagate truth. They have been ridiculed, ignored, subjected to physical violence, interned or imprisoned. The fact that some people have always seen the truth leaves to the remainder the degrading excuse of idiocy.

Three cheers for the 'madmen' like Caligula, Nietzsche, Frederick William IV of Prussia who said that "the answer to democrats is soldiers", and Ludwig II of Bavaria who gave the world Richard Wagner and Bayreuth, Hohenschwangau and Neu Schwanstein. Their alleged 'insanity' is, at least, debatable; the *vox populi* nonsense, the incorrigible stupidity of the 'people' whom Edmund Burke called "the great beast", is not.

In 1876 Britain was the richest, most powerful, most emulated country in the world. Even those which were most hostile (France, the U.S.A., Russia) gave grudging admiration. What else but stupidity has brought her so low?

F/Lt. PETER H. PEEL
Los Angeles, U.S.A.

SIR: In reply to the outrageous statement made by that irresponsible bag of wind, Cyril Smith, is he aware that members of the National Front are Britishers and not scum, as he states? I think he must have a chip on his shoulder.

He should see himself as the nation sees him on television. He is a laughing stock. Perhaps he can inform the nation of the progress made by the Liberal party. Nil! They are on the way out, if he has enough intelligence to realise this.

I fought at Dunkirk, then with the formidable Eighth Army at Alemein and on to Italy, and again on D Day from Normandy on to Germany. What did you do during the war, Smith? Can you be proud of a war record as I am? You I vote rat of the year.

I say: Carry on National Front, and put this country of ours at the top again.

JOHN HUNT
Sutton, Surrey

SIR: I read Martin Webster's October 'Troubleshooting' column with great interest as 15 years ago I was an employee of Van Leer's — the 'Dutch' company that helps to provide funds for the sinister internationalist and multi-racialist organisation called The Centre for Human Rights and Responsibility.

Perhaps you would care to know that in my day the Van Leer Company was on the Arabs' commercial black list, so the owners of this firm are obviously Zionists in addition to being financial sponsors of the C.H.R.R. This fact ties in with the revelation in the article that the boss of the C.H.R.R., 'Austrian' Richard Hauser, is married to the sister of arch 'British' Zionist Yehudi Menuhin.

I would be obliged if Dr. Jacob Gewirtz, the loud-mouthed and aggressive 'American' Chairman of the Defence Committee of the Zionist Board of Deputies of British Jews could explain to the British people (especially the parents of our young soldiers getting shot in Northern Ireland, and the parents of our young Bobbies getting kicked about in Southall) why is it that international Zionist money-bags are interfering in the internal problems of the United Kingdom?

D. L. BARRINGTON
London W.8

LETTER OF THE MONTH

Spearhead publishes the best letter to the press on National Front policy every month. Send your cutting to us not later than the 15th of the previous month. You could win a £1 Nationalist Books voucher. This month's winner (below) was published in the *Ipswich Evening Star*.

Ipswich NF bid

MAY I reply to Mrs. Beryl James's most insulting attack on called for by the Labour party provide the people of Ipswich the National Front and its conference and a ban on the members in your issue of National Front. I ask, who is a September 29?

Firstly, Ian Goddard is not a Nazi; I'm not and we have never met any in the National Front. Judging by what happened to Leicester) the Labour Party is Reg Prentice at Newham. I suggest the Nazis are in the

Labour Party.

What a nerve Mrs. James must have to mount such an attack on another political party at a time when the Labour Government seeks yet another loan of £2,300 million from the world bankers.

Unlimited immigration was the Labour party provide the people of Ipswich the National Front and its conference and a ban on the members in your issue of National Front. I ask, who is a September 29?

After our success in local elections this year (remember, we received 43,000 votes in

The Labour Party is Ipswich branch National Front, I scared and Mrs. James is scared. They know that the decaying

Labour Party has betrayed the British people, and is losing votes fast to the N.F. It's too late trying to stop us now — we have an alternative to think they have a right to rule.

The NF will be fielding 318 candidates at the next election, including one in Ipswich. We will provide the people of Ipswich the National Front and its conference and a ban on the members in your issue of National Front. I ask, who is a September 29?

Let Mrs. James sleep on that! —

CLIVE HOVELL, organiser
e/o Regional H.Q., 253 Robin Hood Road, Norwich.

Trouble shooting

Environmentalists hit back

Perhaps the most important scientific debate in the history of Mankind is the dispute between those scientists who believe that what an individual man or woman is, from the point of view of intelligence and ability, is determined mainly by the **environment** in which the individual or the group grow up, and those scientists who believe that human intelligence and ability is determined mainly by their genetic inheritance or ancestry.

This is **not** a 'dry as dust' academic debate with no relevance to the lives of ordinary people.

Socialists, in pursuit of their egalitarian obsessions, have forced "all in" or comprehensive schooling on our children. They claim that "science proves intelligence and ability is determined by the environment to which an individual is subjected, thus if all children can be subjected to the same educational environment we would be well on the way to building a fair, equal and class-war free society."

Those who support the point of view that intelligence and ability are determined by genetic inheritance (ancestry) will say that no amount of education will make the dull child as bright as the naturally bright child, consequently children's intelligence and ability must be assessed regularly from the outset of their school career so that they can be provided with a type of education especially designed to bring out the best in each.

Socialist environmentalists shriek: "That is elitism!" Supporters of the hereditary view reply: "Maybe — but that is life!"

But the debate over comprehensive education, which has the hereditary/environment dispute as its backdrop, pales into superficial insignificance beside the deeper, long-term **racial implications** of the debate.

History is the record of the rise and fall of civilisations. Each of those civilisations is indelibly linked with a particular and easily identifiable **race** or ethnic group.

Thus the achievements of the **civilisation** are the achievements of the **race**. Race has been, thus far, the cradle of civilisations and nations.

The Internationalist era

Now we are moving into an era when the great forces at large in the world are international and internationalist in their structure and objectives. We have international Communism which expressly seeks

a Communist world government. We also have the international banks and multinational companies — the "International Money Power" — which certainly seeks to build a world government.

Any internationalist force that seeks world government must seek the destruction of nation states. But the mere conquest of a nation does not extirpate a sense of nationhood or nationalism from the hearts of the conquered people. **As long as the race survives, the nation can and will re-assert itself in the fullness of time.**

The internationalists know this and so they seek not merely to destroy nation-states but also to eliminate the possibility of **nationalist** rebellion against their intended world order, by eliminating that which makes nations, national identity and nationalism: **race**.

Thus in their drive for power over the whole of humanity the internationalists have a vital vested interest in encouraging **miscegenation** (the interbreeding between **different racial types** — as opposed to **assimilation** which is interbreeding between **related racial types**).

Resistance to race-mixing comes from those who believe that the laws of genetic inheritance not only determine that individuals will differ in intelligence and ability, but also that the various races of Mankind will differ in this respect.

Thus by encouraging racial miscegenation one may well hope to breed an "equal" World Man — but one will firstly be eliminating the races which, over the centuries, have **proved** themselves to be civilisation producers, and secondly one will be left with no certainty that World Man will be capable of producing or sustaining civilisation. All the evidence is that where racial miscegenation has occurred, civilisation degenerates into lower forms.

Professor Arthur Jensen, Professor Hans Eysenck and other specialists in the field of educational psychology, have during the past ten years produced papers on exhaustive studies they have conducted into the bearing on I.Q. and ability of the environment and heredity. Their researches inclined them strongly to the view that genetic inheritance is a far more important factor than environment. Unable to refute these findings, the environmentalists have been able to do little more than shout abuse.

Now, however, they have started to counter-attack. It seems that a new book *Who Do You Think You Are?* by Oliver Gillie is soon to be published. This book seeks to discredit the whole of the case for heredity by purporting to show that Sir

Cyril Burt, a leading pro-heredity educational psychologist of the 1920's and 30's faked much of his 'scientific' data.

The Sunday Times in reviewing Gillie's book (24/10/76) published photos of Arthur Jensen and Hans Eysenck in such a way as to imply that in discrediting Burt, their findings were also invalidated. Such an implication was propagandistic and quite as fraudulent as the alleged inventions of Burt. Jensen, Eysenck and company's findings were based on independent research conducted years after Burt was dead!

While considering scientific charlatans it is worth remembering that the father of modern sociology, the Marxist Franz Boas, who first articulated environmentalism on a "scientific" basis, published a paper which set out to prove that the European settlers in North America were becoming "Red Indian in type" — that is, taking on the mental and physical attributes of the Red Indian race — simply because they were living in the Red Indians' environment.

Propaganda tricks such as that engaged in by *The Sunday Times* show just how rattled the environmentalist camp has become!

SPEARHEAD FUND

SPEARHEAD is not at the moment able to be self-supporting; it needs **voluntary contributions over and above income from sales and subscriptions in order to meet running costs.**

Your help would be greatly appreciated. Please make out your postal orders or cheques to **Spearhead**, and send them to: 91 Connaught Road, Teddington, Middx.

NORTH OF ENGLAND N.F. GRAND CHRISTMAS DANCE FRIDAY DECEMBER 10th

This occasion promises to be the biggest NF get-together the North has ever seen. A suite (ballroom and separate cocktail bar) has been booked in an elegant country-style hotel on the outskirts of Manchester, within easy reach of motorways.

A fine buffet, a trio and disco provide the entertainment with party games, raffle, spot prizes etc. all part of the evening.

A nearby hotel offers bed and breakfast at £4 per head for those wishing to stay the night.

Tickets £2.50 each from Martin Goucher, 113 Wilton Road, Hr. Crumpsall, Manchester 8.

AGM celebrates year of success

THE National Front held its 1976 Annual General Meeting at the Conway Hall in London on Saturday, 16th October after perhaps the most successful year in its history. The spirit of party unity was never stronger. Factionalism and internal strife which characterised the previous year were gone, and members left the meeting with renewed confidence in a revitalised National Front. The most positive affirmation of this was the enthusiastic collection of no less than £1,400.

Reports by the Chairmen of Departments of the NF National Directorate, given in the morning session, bore witness to the progress made in all fields during 1976, especially in membership recruitment, branch development, elections and publicity. Robin May, for the Branch Development & Elections Department, reported that 41 new units of the party had been formed during 1976, and that the formation of such units had averaged almost one a week. Richard Verrall, for the Administration Department, announced the recruitment of well over 3000 new members in the nine months of the year up to October, and the average national distribution of a quarter of a million leaflets every month. The remarkable success of the new NF paper *National Front News* and its vital propaganda value for the party was described by Publicity Department Chairman, Martin Webster.

All resolutions pertaining to Constitutional Amendments put forward on behalf of the National Directorate were carried overwhelmingly. These included the definition of further disciplinary offences, including the committing of acts of disloyalty to the party; the right of the Directorate to determine the annual subscription rate; the substitution of a short *Statement of Principles* as Annex I of the Constitution; and the election of the Chairman and Deputy-Chairman of the party by postal ballot of the whole membership in the event of the posts being contested by more than one candidate. This amendment also incorporated the provision that any such candidate for the Chairmanship must have served a period of three Directorate years within the last four years including the year prior to nomination.

Resolutions advocating tax-exempt widows' and widowers' pensions, opposing the party political patronage inherent in the lay magistrate system, and condemning the use of the trade union movement as a means of promoting immigration were carried overwhelmingly. Carried unanimously was a resolution calling for Britain's North Sea oil resources to be placed solely under British control and ownership.

Fierce denunciation of the impending Race Relations legislation and the sell-out of Rhodesia by Ian Smith and John Vorster



NF Deputy Chairman Andrew Fountaine addresses the meeting. Left to right Martin Webster, John Tyndall, A.G.M. chairman Graham Manning, Richard Verrall and Andrew Brons.

were embodied in resolutions that were also unanimously carried, as was a motion proposed by Robert Relf calling on native-born White citizens to sell their houses to White people only.

WHITE DEFENCE GROUPS

As a result of the proposer departing from the wording of the original resolution, a motion calling upon the party to look with favour on White Citizens Defence Groups in immigrant-infested areas was lost. The meeting called on the Government to reverse the policy of employing poorly qualified Immigrant doctors in the National Health Service by ensuring adequate payment for British-born doctors.

Carried unanimously were two major resolutions on the economy — one calling for the progressive reduction to zero of imported manufactured goods, the restriction of British capital investment overseas and the abolition of the debt system of finance; and the other demanding the establishment of major public works schemes in order to counter-act the appalling number of unemployed British school-leavers and condemning the opposition to such schemes by trade union leaders.

Before his final address to the meeting, the Chairman of the National Front, John Tyndall, awarded special commendations and Gold Badges, the Branch Development Cup for membership recruitment (again won by Leicester Branch), and finally a special award to the heroic fighter against the Race Board Robert Relf, inscribed with a tribute to his struggle "on behalf of the British Race and Nation".

Editorship

National Activities Organiser Martin Webster has been formally appointed Editor of the new paper *National Front News* by the NF National Directorate. Assistant Editor will be Richard Verrall.

NF News continues to break all sales records. 1000 copies alone are now regularly sold in East London's Brick Lane market in a single morning, much to the chagrin of the International Drop-Outs who have difficulty in selling 50 copies of their comic *Socialist Worker*.

New Policy Booklet

The NF Policy Department has brought out a new publication in its range of policy booklets, *Education for National Survival*.

The booklet provides a comprehensive account of National Front education policy, and particularly the political and social conditions necessary for education reform. Price 20p, the booklet is well illustrated.

NEW!

NATIONAL FRONT 'T' SHIRTS

All sizes available
£2.00 plus 25p postage

Send to:

RAY DOWLER,
15 Upper Street,
Knowle, Bristol BS4 3BU.
Bristol Branch Organiser

N.F. MOVING INTO SCOTLAND

The National Front is beginning to make its first real impression in Scotland, a vital step if the NF is to become a truly national party. The formation of an active Group in Edinburgh by NF students Mike Corfield and Martin Heath was the first step earlier this year. A Group in Perth was then established, followed most recently by the formation of a lively all-Scottish Group in Dundee which is already making good progress in recruitment.

The establishment of the NF in Scotland has certainly made some contribution to the growing awareness of the National Front north of the border, with regular attacks on the party in the left-wing *Scotsman* newspaper which fears NF success at the expense of the bogus S.N.P. "nationalists".

The National Front will be making its first serious impact at the polls in Scotland in the next General Election. The party will certainly be fighting the Edinburgh South and Dundee constituencies.



Members of the NF Edinburgh Group pictured with their banner

"Next time ... It's got to be National Front"

That's the message that rang loud and clear in the Letters Page of the *Evening News* recently, reproduced opposite. Out of eight letters printed, five were opposed to immigration, of which two exhorted people to "Vote National Front" at the next election. "We are sick of reading that we must accept these conditions", said one writer, "and though I have voted Labour all my life I am afraid that next time it will have to be National Front".

The *Evening News* is the highest circulation evening newspaper in the world, and is no friend of the National Front. That paper would not have published letters in this proportion unless they had been positively deluged with anti-immigration and pro-NF letters! Translated into votes, that could mean already around 3 million potential NF voters — our job is to get out and find them!

ANNUAL NATIONAL FRONT REMEMBRANCE DAY MARCH

Sunday, 14th November

Assemble near Victoria Station at 2.45 p.m.
Assemble at GROSVENOR GARDENS
not Bressenden Place as in previous years.

Railwaymen!

JOIN THE NATIONAL FRONT RAILWAYMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Enquiries c/o NFRA, 91 Connaught Road,
Teddington, Middlesex.

MR. Praful Patel, the Asians' leader, must learn that we enjoy freedom of speech in Britain.

Enoch Powell's speech may have been offensive towards the immigrant population but as a British citizen he must be allowed to be heard.

So let's have no more of this.

May I quote from Mr. Patel, who said "that speech should be killed before it starts by those with power to do so."

No one is stopping Mr. Patel or anyone else from standing up and convincing the average man and woman of these pleasant islands that the massive influx of immigrants during the present state of unemployment and near bankruptcy are beneficial to our economy.

I am just one of thousands of worried housewives with a hard-working heavily-taxed husband who, for their own peace of mind, would dearly love to be convinced.

So please try me Mr. Patel.
— MRS. ELSIE BASSETT,
Reckton Road, Orpington.

Too small

I DISAGREE with several points in Enoch Powell's speech. But while I have many good coloured friends, he is right in saying we are trying to put a quart into a

WRITE to Readers' Letters, *Evening News*,
Carmelite House, London EC4Y 0JA.
Or telephone your letter to 353 5801.

half pint pot by allowing so many people into this country.

You could send all Britain and part of the Continent to India and there would still be enough room for more immigrants.

We are too small to house so many as we do and we are struggling for economic survival as well. — (Mrs.) PHILLIS HAWKES, Bourne Estate Holborn.

Election

THE British public can end immigrant troubles, before they get worse, by voting for the National Front at the next election. — MARK LAVINE, Huxley Road, Edmonton.

Muggings

PEOPLE don't realise that Enoch Powell and organisations like the National Front offer the only crumb of comfort to people in high immigration areas like Hackney.

Old people here are mugged practically every day by young coloured youths.

Coloured neighbours play reggae records continuously at high volume and hold all night parties which, apparently, cannot be stopped.

We are sick of reading that we must accept these

conditions and though I have voted Labour all my life I am afraid that next time it will have to be National Front. — WORRIED VOTER, Clapton.

Million

THE cost of giving one million Asians and West Indians £1,000 each to return to their native lands would be recouped later, with interest, through a surplus on the social security budget. — J. F. COLLINS, Leytonstone.

Tragedy

IT would be a tragedy to send home the working coloured immigrants, like the doctors, nurses and busmen. Deport the coloured scroungers—but if so send with them, man for man, a few thousand fit but workshy white Britons who live off the fat of the welfare state. — JOHN SIMONS, Croxted Road, West Dulwich.

Nurses

WOULD Enoch Powell refuse treatment from a black nurse in a hospital that was already bursting at the seams with white British patients? — ROSEMARY WILLIAMS, Brixton Water Lane, Brixton.

NATHANIEL WEYL

The threat of genetic decay

Reprinted from an article in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, 1 Darnaway Street, Edinburgh.

IN EUROPE, between the breakdown of the Roman Empire in the West and the Industrial Revolution, reproduction was uniformly high and the main check on population growth was high mortality. This vastly favoured the rich and the educated.

As the Middle Ages waned, the disintegration of traditional breeding barriers meant enlarged opportunities for mate selection and greater ability to choose intelligent wives. Sacerdotal celibacy had served as a painless gas chamber for much of the intellect of Europe. The Reformation destroyed its power for evil in the northern and western European countries which became Protestant, but amplified its effect in those lands which remained Catholic. With the later rise of science and scepticism, the Catholic Church no longer attracted the European intelligentsia and the infertility of its priesthood ceased to be of much importance to society.

The brief triumph of liberal doctrines in politics, government and economics made individual ability more important than lineage and inherited status as a measure of worth. This created an ideal ambience for assortative mating of the best.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, concerned students of population noted that the fertility of the educated, the intelligent and the successful was lagging behind that of the masses. This was occurring at a time when advances in medicine and public health were narrowing the gap between the death rates of the two social groups.

For a long time, it was assumed that the infertility of the highly educated was largely an economic matter, that they chose small families because their low salaries and their need for education required that course. In recent decades, there has been a spec-

tacular rise in the salary levels of the intellectuals and of the highly educated. This has not caused any corresponding increase in the size of their families. Last year, I made a study of the 14,000 or so members of American Mensa, the high-I.Q. society. I found that the lifetime fertility of the average Mensa couple (that is to say, Mensa member and spouse) was 1.6 children. This was 27 per cent below the national average. It was not enough to provide zero population growth. Even assuming null-mortality, the Mensa population would shrink by 60 per cent in two generations.

If we look at some of the other factors which affected the Roman élite, we see interesting parallels and differences between third century Rome and twentieth century America.

In both systems, there is a wide gap between the frequency and sophistication of the contraceptive and abortive techniques of the classes and the masses. However, in contemporary America, that gap is closing.

Punitive income and inheritance taxes and cradle-to-grave social security have probably made the Galtonian effect largely irrelevant to the contemporary Western civilization area.

Involuntary sterility, caused by inter-marriage between different ethnic and national strains, may operate to significantly diminish fertility. If so, this will have much more impact on the creative minority than on the masses. The skewed class composition of would-be adoptive parents suggests that forces for involuntary sterility operate disproportionately against the highly educated.

As in Rome, the effect of the infertility of the capable has been masked temporarily by other developments. Improvements in education and promotion, provision of magnificent research facilities, the breakdown of class and race barriers to education and leadership, and the brain-drain imposed on less fortunate countries — all these have caused a continuing recruitment of men and women of outstanding ability.

Simultaneously, assortative mating for intelligence has largely replaced fertility as the main means of providing the United States with a sufficiently large corps of

brilliant people to maintain the ferment of creation, invention and discovery.

The prospect, however, is that the efficacy of assortative mating for intelligence will decline because of mounting ideological and institutional pressures imposed by the dominant egalitarian ideology and the Establishment. There is already evidence of this. Seventy years ago, William James could boast that "we alumni and alumnae of the colleges are the only permanent presence that corresponds to the aristocracy of other countries."

The American college population today cannot by the wildest stretch of imagination be equated with an aristocracy of any sort. Its selectivity has been largely destroyed by the open university, by the assault on intelligence testing, by the demand for "relevant" education and by the imposition by government of racial and sexual quotas on both student bodies and faculties.

Thus, dysgenic reproduction and the impeding of assortative mating operate in unison to bring progressive intellectual impoverishment to the United States and Western Europe. In the communist world, similar processes are occurring, but on a monstrously magnified scale. In the West, there is a shortfall in the fertility of the creative élites. In the Soviet and Chinese communist worlds, these élites were hunted down and exterminated in the genocidal and aristocidal purges characteristic of the revolutionary phases of communist power. In the West, assortative mating is being eroded by such measures as debauching higher education through the forced injection of incompetents on racial grounds. In the communist world, the régimes intervene to fling the bright and the stupid into juxtaposition. In the Chinese case, the state directly encourages marriages between intellectuals and peasants.

Thus, the egalitarian ideology involves the use of state action to take measures which should arrest and reverse man's evolutionary progress in genetic terms and which may serve to bring into existence future generations so mediocre and spiritless that they will serve as pliant instruments of the gargantuan state.

FIND OUT ABOUT THE NATIONAL FRONT

Send 15p for information pack.

Name

Send 20p extra for copy of manifesto for General Election of October, 1974.

Address

To: NATIONAL FRONT
91 CONNAUGHT ROAD
TEDDINGTON, MIDDX.
(Tel. 01-977 2452)

I enclose